

97-84061-8

Carrington, Edith

Legal and illegal cruelty

[London]


1902

97-84061-8
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD



RESTRICTIONS ON USE: Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm

REDUCTION RATIO: 11:1

IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 4-1-97

INITIALS: PB

TRACKING #: 23026

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.



ev

308

Z

Box 153

LEGAL AND ILLEGAL CRUELTY

BY

EDITH CARRINGTON

REVISED BY

W. R. HADWEN, M.D., L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., I.S.A.

SECOND EDITION

SOCIETY FOR THE ABOLITION OF VIVISECTION,
23, NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1902

LEGAL AND ILLEGAL CRUELTY.

IN a free country like our own, the National Laws form a fair test of the National Conscience. The laws are made by the people, and they represent the aggregate opinion of the Community as regards the nature of crime and the deserts of criminals. Thus, while human opinion remains fallible, and civilization is constantly progressing, the Laws stand in need of frequent amendment.

This necessity for improvement is nowhere more plainly seen than in the Laws which aim at preventing Cruelty to Animals, because, being still comparatively recent, they are in a crude condition.

It was not until 1822 that public opinion was ripe enough to pronounce cruelty to animals a crime at all. Before that date it was not punishable by Law. In that year Martin's Act was passed, rendering it illegal to cruelly beat, illtreat, overdrive, abuse or torture, or cause to be cruelly beaten, illtreated, abused or tortured, any domestic animal.

Cruelty to animals then has been since 1822 an offence in the eye of the Law.

But a careful study of what follows will show that our Legal System has fallen into the most mischievous and demoralising of all possible errors, namely, that of treating the same offence differently when committed by different orders of men. Our Laws convict and punish ordinary men, women and children for cruelty, but license cruelty committed

by scientific men, for purposes alleged to be scientific. Against this system it may be urged:

Firstly, that it is immoral to put forward the expectation of some public good as a justification for licensing cruelty.

Secondly, that it is not just to punish one class for cruelty while another class is permitted, practically without interference, to commit the most cruel actions.

Let facts speak for themselves as to the unjust bearing of our anti-cruelty Laws as they are now administered, and let the reader judge.

The Report of the R.S.P.C.A. for 1900 tells that 7,894 persons were convicted and punished by Law during that year for cruelty, of which the following cases, under the heading "ILLEGAL CRUELTY" are fair types. They are all taken from a book of newspaper reports, recently brought up to date, and published by the Society. (*Cruelty to Animals, Suggestions, Acts, &c.*, to be had gratis on application to the Secretary, 104, Jermyn Street, London.) The cases are necessarily condensed. It must be borne in mind that this noble Society is not responsible for the Law; but that it exerts itself in enforcing such Laws as exist, and strives for their amendment.

From the Official Report on Vivisection for the same year we find on the other hand that 247 persons were licensed by the Law to perpetrate cruelties on animals, of which the cases under the heading LEGAL CRUELTY are fair samples. Three of them are taken from a book by Dr. Crile, called "*An Experimental Research into Surgical Shock.*" This man "used" 148 animals in the course of his "Research." The first sixteen of the series, from which the three are selected, were performed in the laboratory of University College, London, and Dr. Crile heartily thanks

Professor Victor Horsley, (one of our most pronounced English Vivisectors,) for permission to use the place. The position and influence, past and present, of Professor Horsley in this country makes the revelation of his encouragement and approval of Dr. Crile a sinister one.

As experiments on "*shock*" were his aim, Dr. Crile wished, of course, to produce as much shock as possible in hapless animals; nearly all of them dogs. He tore their tongues, broke their jaw-bones, and crushed their paws; he burnt their muzzles with flame, he exposed the sciatic nerve and snipped off pieces from it; he put their feet into boiling water, he "whipped the intestines" and poured boiling water on them. He extirpated the eye and bruised the socket, he "severely pinched the gall bladder," pinched the tongue, forced open the jaw beyond its natural point, and in fact, went through all the organs in turn, and tested them by such methods as his ingenuity might devise. To what extent the unhappy creatures were alive to their sufferings is a question. He says (p. 14): "In all cases the animals were anæsthetised" (made insensible to suffering) "usually by chloroform, either alone or with ether. In a few cases curare and morphine were used."

A word as to these drugs.

In his recent work, "*Scientific Research*," Mr. Stephen Smith, M.R.C.S., quotes the following from a letter written to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, by F. Borel, M.D. (Aug. 5th, 1889):—"I have vivisected birds, horses, frogs, rabbits, monkeys and above all, dogs; and I can affirm three things.

"1. That it is nearly completely impossible to employ anæsthetics upon them so as to render them insensible, as for example, ether, chloroform, chloral, opium, (morphine, codeine), cannabis indica, (haschich), &c.

"2. That the sufferings of animals are so great after the experiments that they are altogether stupefied, the most ferocious dogs allow themselves to be used, later on, with the indifference of sheep; one must not

absolutely confound their tranquillity with the relief given to a man after a necessary surgical operation, but as the apathy and indifference of a martyr.

"3. The employment of curare, far from diminishing sensibility, augments it exceedingly. Anyone who is accustomed to a laboratory, to physiology, or to pathological experiment, knows that animals suffer when vivisected and greatly, till death comes to deliver them."

Mr. Stephen Smith adds (p. 46) :—

"The Vivisector does not realize what he is doing. The animal to him is merely a creaking machine. The experimenter may be a very respectable citizen. But no victim of the Inquisition, no prisoner of a Red Indian, is more to be pitied than many an unhappy dog who has found his way into a laboratory. The difficulty of giving anæsthetics, the attitude of the experimenter,—his inevitable belief that animals do not feel much,—have a practical significance. If the experiments on the Strassburg dogs (mentioned in Chapter I.) were published, the account would read, 'Ether was the anæsthetic used.' In similar cases the animal is debarred from the relief of proper anæsthesia through the indifference of the experimenter. But when curare is used, anæsthesia is practically impossible. Curare is used daily throughout England. Mention of an anæsthetic in a report is no guarantee that the animal was anæsthetised."

Of Chloroform, W. Gimson Gimson, M.D., M.R.C.S., says :—

"To many the mention of chloroform, ether, or *alia*" (other anæsthetics) "conveys the idea of abolition of pain—but ask the multitude, and evidence will be at once forthcoming that they are not unmitigated boons, nay, they are, up to certain points, extreme torture, and anyone who has administered chloroform frequently to dogs must have seen this statement borne out with reference to them." (*Vivisections and Painful Experiments on Living Animals, their Unjustifiability*, p. 62.)

Dr. Klein, in giving evidence before the Royal Commission, 1875, stated that he thought the administration of chloroform

caused pain to a dog, making him "*struggle very hard*." (*Royal Commission Report*, Q. 3654.)

Of Morphia, Claude Bernard, a most barbarous Vivisector, says: "Narcotised with morphine, the animal still remains sensitive—he feels pain, but so to speak, has lost the idea of self-defence. Placed on the ground he can move, walk, try to hide—placed in the Vivisection Trough he lies motionless." (*Leçons de Physiologie Opératoire*, p. 155.)

Of Curare Claude Bernard says: "Curare, acting on the nervous system, only suppresses the action of the motor nerves, leaving sensation intact. Curare is not an anæsthetic. Curare renders all movement impossible, but it does not hinder the animal from suffering and from being conscious of pain." (*Revue Scientifique*, 1871-2, p. 892. Also Vol. VI., p. 591.)

Dr. George Hoggan, M.B., C.M., wrote: "I am inclined to look upon anæsthetics as the greatest curse to vivisectionable animals." (Letter to *Morning Post*, February 2nd, 1875.)

Moreover, Dr. Crile confesses that in all cases anæsthesia was not "complete" during his experiments. He gives instances of results obtained before the animals had given the usual signs of unconsciousness. We are told of "struggles" which ensued on the application of flame. We read that animals were allowed to "partially recover" from the anæsthetics before completion of the experiment and of some cases where anæsthesia was "incomplete throughout."

The other extracts in the column of Legal Cruelties are taken from various sources named in each case. All were done in Great Britain, unpublished by British Law. They are not "ancient history" nor "done abroad," a defence frequently set up by those who applaud Vivisection or who avoid its contemplation. The first case is a specimen of

experiments carried out at Owen's College, Manchester. It is now likely that such experiments will be repeated wholesale if the nation allows it. Hecatombs of domestic animals will be sacrificed. Paragraphs in the daily papers announce the coming carnage, of which this will serve as a specimen:—

"An important discovery as to the pathology of tuberculosis or consumption has been made at Liverpool University College, which will shortly be communicated to the British Association at its Glasgow Session. It will be announced by Professor R. U. Boyce, who is one of the experts just appointed to the Royal Commission which is to inquire into the whole subject of consumption—its causes and cure. University College is licensed for Vivisection on purpose, and Professor Boyce has carried on a series of experiments there to show the possibility of transmitting tubercle bacilli, the seeds of consumption, from animals to men." (*Northern Daily Mail*, September 7th, 1901.)

Whereas previous cruelties to cattle practised in Germany by Professor Koch went to prove the contrary!

CASE I.

ILLEGAL.

W. H. D—, a gentleman farmer and homeopathic doctor, was charged at Guildford Petty Sessions, with starving animals, namely, a number of steers and cows on his farm. Mr. Colam, Secretary, R.S.P.C.A., conducted the case in person, and stated that on a former occasion defendant had been convicted for a similar offence. On the date of offence his premises were visited. There was no food in the barns nor in the stables, nor in the sheds, and the animals consequently wandered about the fields, which

LEGAL.

The *British Medical Journal*, October 26th, 1901, describes a series of experiments just carried out by Sheridan Delépine, M.B., C.M., Proctor Professor of Pathology, Owen's College, Manchester. He begins by saying, "Mr. Holburn, the Chief Veterinary Surgeon Inspector, kindly undertook to buy for me some healthy calves. . . . The cost of the experiment prevented my using more than four.

"First calf inoculated in the lung with 5 c. cm. of mixed tuberculous sputum" (expectoration). 'Death

ILLEGAL.

were bare of grass, in search of food in the most listless and helpless condition, with an expression of despair. The poor creatures sank down in the mud and slush of the farmyard as night came on from sheer weakness, and one poor cow was found embedded and frozen in mire, whose tail actually fell off from frost-bite as soon as her body was removed to a place of shelter. The defendant, who did not appear, was sentenced to three months' imprisonment with hard labour his advocate pleaded that he was not liable under the statute owing to some disagreement with his landlord. A warrant for his apprehension was granted, and he was found secreted in a locked and bolted room at Gosport, from which he was conducted to Wandsworth prison (*Cruelty to Animals*, p. 394).

LEGAL.

on the sixth day. Generalised tuberculosis not due to the inoculation.

"Second calf inoculated under the skin of the leg (5 c. cm. of mixed sputa). Death on the sixth day.

"Third calf given 50 c. cm. of mixed sputa with its food in one day. Death 26 days after the ingestion of the tuberculous material.

"Fourth calf, 5 c. cm. of mixed sputa injected into the peritoneum. . . . Definite tuberculin reaction 68 days after inoculation.

. . . . Therefore, of the four calves experimented upon, only two survived long enough to allow definite results to be obtained, and these two calves had contracted tuberculosis as the result of ingestion of or peritoneal infection with human tuberculous sputa."

Sheridan Delépine finishes his article by the statement that he "takes this opportunity of acknowledging the facilities offered to him by the Manchester Sanitary Committee for the prosecution of more extended experiments. Very soon after the beginning of this investigation," he adds, "Dr. A. Hodgkinson also generously offered to bear the cost of experiments conducted on a farm belonging to him."

Koch himself acknowledges that tuberculosis can only be successfully combated by an improved sanitation and the

better housing of the poor. (*British Medical Journal*, July 27th, 1901.)

CASE 2.

ILLEGAL.

F—K—, a boy of ten years old, was summoned for gross cruelty to a dog by slowly drowning it. A boy saw him throw the dog into a shallow pool of water, and as soon as it crawled out again he threw it back. This he did ten times, and then threw it into a deeper pond, and after that threw it into a hedge. Witness went to take it out of the hedge when defendant threatened to strike him, and once more defendant threw the dog into the pond and said, "If it is dead to-morrow I will come and make a hole and bury it." Defendant was fined ten shillings and costs, the Chairman remarking that it was a gross case which would have called for a heavier penalty if defendant had been older. (*Ib.*, p. 283.)

Though the cruelties described in the right-hand column were perpetrated before Vivisection was formally taken under the protection of the law in 1876, they took place, and were unpunished, many years after the Law had forbidden cruelty to animals. The Law now openly protects such things.

ILLEGAL.

E—H—, a solicitor, was summoned by the R.S.P.C.A. to appear before the Newport (Isle

LEGAL.

The following are a few particulars taken from a series of 76 experiments on living animals, in only a few of which anaesthesia (insensibility to suffering) "was present; and after the terrible sufferings caused by plugging their windpipes to suffocate them, holding them under water, and in some cases restoring them to life, for further experimentation, burying their heads in liquid plaster of Paris, or mercury, cauterizing their bodies with an iron heated to a white heat, &c., &c., the Committee, it will be seen, report that they were unable to recommend any material improvement in the plan adopted by the Society." (*Appendix to Report of Royal Commission on Vivisection*, 1875, p. 365.)

CASE 3.

LEGAL.

Dr. Cecil Shaw, who held no license, reported in the *British Medical Journal*, of June 18th, 1899,

ILLEGAL.

of Wight) Police Court for cruelly torturing a rabbit. Jane Money deposed that defendant came into a shop where she was. In one hand he held a rabbit by its hind legs and in the other a ferret. He let the ferret take hold of the rabbit, and the rabbit cried out so dreadfully that she entreated defendant to take the ferret away. He did not do so, and she pushed him out of the shop. The ferret had hold of the rabbit all the time. She said, "I seem as if I could see the poor thing's eyes now." Thomas Bartlett, who saw the defendant on a public road on the day in question, said his attention was arrested by a dreadful screech. He looked, and under defendant's arm he saw a ferret, and in his other hand was a live rabbit which the ferret had fixed right between the shoulders. Witness felt the rabbit, and there was life's warmth in the poor thing then. Defendant kept the ferret there sucking away at the rabbit's life blood. Witness said, "You scoundrel, you ought to be ashamed of yourself, you ought to be flogged." The Bench said it was torture as well as cruelty, and it had been a question whether the defendant ought not to be committed to prison without the option of a fine. They fined him £5 and costs, and warned

LEGAL.

"an account of tortures which he had inflicted on rabbits. In one case he punctured the eye and rubbed into the wound powdered jequirity seeds" (a powerful irritant) "for varying periods up to six months," in order to discover "whether prolonged irritation of a rabbit's eye would produce any visible organic changes in the ciliary region, either in the irritated eye or the other."

After the six weeks of torment his further proceedings on the wretched rabbit were as follows: "Internal irritation was then tried, small shot being inserted into the eye, again without any antiseptic precautions. In fact soiled instruments were purposely used to reproduce, as far as possible, the kind of wound which is most often found to cause sympathetic ophthalmia. When the incision was made in the sclerotic a few millimetres above the corneal margin, a little vitreous escaped on the shot being put in, but the wound healed rapidly and all signs of irritation disappeared. In another the shot was similarly expelled, but after some weeks, and irritation is still present at the end of five months, as shown by injection in the neighbourhood of the wound. But no signs of iritis are to be seen either in the thummatized

ILLEGAL.

him that if another charge were proved against him he would be committed to prison. (*Id.*, p. 544.)

LEGAL.

eye or the other. This rabbit I have kept alive to observe how long the irritation lasts."

The inefficacy of the system of Inspection and the futility of the law as administered under the present Act, are amply illustrated by this case. Dr. Shaw held no license, and on his own confession, practised vivisection without one. When brought to book by the Anti-vivisectionists he said that he had not performed the experiments himself, but that Dr. Lorrain Smith performed them. Sheltered under this "ambiguity of expression," as he described his falsehood, he was permitted by the Home Secretary to escape punishment. Most of us know the pain which a grain of dust causes, if it settles on the eyeball, but few can conceive what these creatures underwent during their weeks and months of misery.

Still more cruel than the Legal Cruelty to rabbits above described, were a series of experiments by Dr. E. Klein, F.R.S., on cats, inasmuch as the carnivora are presumably more sensitive to pain than the rodentia.

In his *Further Report on the Etiology of Diphtheria* (Appendix B), he makes the following statements, (p. 156).

"During the year just past" (presumably 1889) "a number of additional experiments on the cat's cornea and conjunctiva have been instituted with cultivations of the diphtheria bacillus. . . . I subjoin a few instances of successful inoculation of cats.

"1. With this cat's cornea bacillus, . . . the scraped cornea of a fresh cat was inoculated.

"2. From a subculture . . . the scraped cornea was inoculated in two cats.

"3. From a culture the cornea and conjunctiva (previously scraped) of two cats were inoculated, etc. In both these animals the disease set in with great intensity. . . . On the fourteenth day both eyes of this cat

were closed, copious muco-purulent matter had collected, etc. . . . This animal was killed on the seventeenth day, the disease still progressing. The ulcer on the cornea reached down to the Descemet membrane.

"4. From an Agar subculture . . . the cornea . . . of two other cats were inoculated. . . . One of these cats was killed on the fifteenth day; in this case one cornea was opaque, . . . the other showed a deep crater-like ulcer with raised opaque margin; conjunctiva much congested, swollen and coated with purulent matter. The other cat had on this day considerable suppuration from the conjunctiva of both eyes, etc."

(See also *Supplement to the Nineteenth Annual Report of the Local Government Board* for 1889-90, pp. 143-176.)

Then follow descriptions of over twenty cases in which painful symptoms followed maltreatment of cats by Klein.

CASE 4.

ILLEGAL.

M— C—, Rottingdean, was charged at Lewes Petty Sessions with cruelty to about one hundred animals, consisting of dogs, cats, etc., by starving them by withholding from them sufficient nourishing food. It was proved at the hearing that the defendant left the animals in question in charge of two servants while she travelled from place to place for her own enjoyment. She remitted no money to the servants who were also starved for want of food, and had in consequence to pawn a great portion of their clothing. In her defence she stated that she had given orders to her servants to procure food from tradesmen who also had undertaken

LEGAL.

Walter Edmunds, M.D., submitted animals at the Laboratory of the Brown Institute to torture. During a series of experiments he operated upon 18 dogs. Whether chloroform was administered in the initial operation he does not say, but the primary fixing of the dog and opening of the neck would be nothing to the long lingering illness to which the animals were compelled to submit in their prison. Owing to the difficulty of the operation only 11 of the 18 dogs had their parathyroids cut out. From two of three dogs he cut out one lobe of the thyroid gland at the same time. One of them died the night after and the other survived to have

ILLEGAL.

to supply it during her absence, and therefore she was not guilty under the statute. The Bench commented severely on her gross cruelty, which was committed under pretence of humanity towards animals which she had picked up in the streets and professed to take care of. There could be no question that she received information from time to time respecting the condition of these animals which entirely deprived her defence of any weight and moreover she had refused to permit the animals to be killed which were in a suffering condition. They therefore sentenced her to three months' imprisonment. The defendant (an able and accomplished woman,—a painter and author) was afterwards convicted for a similar offence on three different occasions. (*Ib.*, p. 438.)

There is a fine likeness between the conduct of the woman whose hypocritical simulation of the Good Samaritan ended in her confinement in jail for starving the poor waifs which she professed to befriend, and the Vivisector who turns a hospital for animals into an inferno where they are tortured to death. The Brown Institute was intended, by its benevolent founder, to be a boon to suffering creatures: his Will contains the following proviso—"And I further desire that kindness to the animals under his" (the Superintendent's) "care shall be a general principle of the Institution to be founded as aforesaid." The Brown Institute,

LEGAL.

another lobe cut away when it died too. Of the remaining nine, one died after lingering two days, another in four days, one in seven days, while another lingered in misery for 28 days. The remaining dogs were then re-opened and submitted to excision (cutting out) of one thyroid lobe, and surviving this, were again fastened down and had the remaining lobe removed. Three out of the five died, but two survived, only at the price of tremours, a stumbling walk, sometimes passing into paralysis of the hinder limbs, emaciation and muscular weakness. Of the remaining dogs one lived on in a paralytic condition for 72 days. All were submitted to operation until death released them from the hand of their tormentor. (See *Journal of Pathology and Bacteriology*, May, 1899.)

Wandsworth Road, London, founded when Vivisection was comparatively unknown, (otherwise no doubt the founder would have forbidden it within those walls,) has now become a hot-bed of Vivisection. This is a pretty specimen of the manner in which money is diverted from the purpose for which it is bequeathed or subscribed!

CASE 5.

ILLEGAL.

L— M— C—, domestic servant, aged 14, was charged at Rugby Police Court with torturing a kitten, by putting it into a hot oven and closing the door. When taken out the poor creature was nearly dead, and the police constable said it lay "in its own fat." She confessed, and said she did not know what made her do it. Afterwards, before the magistrates, she said, "It scratched my hands." Sentenced by Mr. Boughton Leigh to one month's imprisonment with hard labour. (*Ib.*, p. 282.)

LEGAL.

Dr. Lauder Brunton, in an article "*On the Alterations in the Action of Digitalis produced by Febrile Temperature*," *Practitioner*, Vol. 33, pp. 272-281, in the preparation of which he was assisted by Dr. Theodore Cash, relates how he performed a series of experiments on rabbits and cats. He subjected the animals to a temperature which raised the body heat to over 113 deg. Fahr. In one case he tells us that "*death occurred from heat*" (hyperpyrexia), or in other words, the cat was baked to death.

This is another sample of juvenile depravity heavily visited, while adult inhumanity escapes.

The ensuing is an account of a series of vivisections carried on by W. M. Bayliss, B.Sc., and Leonard Hill, Assistant Professor of Physiology, University College, London, &c., &c. They are taken from the *Journal of Physiology*, Vol. 18, May, 1897, where they were described by the persons who performed them. The passages in italics are comments by W. R. Hadwen, M.D., L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., I.S.A.

CASE 6.

ILLEGAL.

G— H—, butcher, was charged at the Bournemouth Police Court, by the R.S.P.C.A., with cruelly ill-treating and torturing a dog. Frederick Colbourne, 15 years old, said that on the day in question while walking through the trees at Richmond Park at about half-past twelve o'clock he heard a noise as of a child crying. On looking round he saw a man under the trees about 120 yards away. He was holding a knife in his hand, and witness saw him stoop down two or three times and then stand up again and sharpen the knife against another. The cries of distress continued throughout this period "for upwards of ten minutes." Witness ran to the shop of his employer, Mr. Dunn, a fish dealer, and told him of the occurrence. Afterwards he accompanied Mr. Dunn to the spot and saw the defendant skinning a dog with a pocket knife. He noticed that defendant's hands were covered with blood. Defendant spoke to him saying, "If that was a child you would go and tell," and witness replying "Yes," defendant said, "No you wouldn't, I should not give you the chance."

Defendant also said that he had killed the dog because he could not find a home for it, and because

LEGAL.

"The animals employed for this research were in all cases dogs. Throughout the experiments morphia was the anæsthetic used." (P. 337.)

But, as conclusively shown on page 5, upon the evidence of Claude Bernard, morphia is not an anæsthetic. It narcotizes only and would never be used in painful operative procedures upon the human subject.

"Method of research. A cannula was placed in the central end of the carotid artery. A second long cannula was passed down the external jugular vein, and on the same side into the right auricle." (P. 337.)

"We carried on the research in the following ways: (1) We divided the vago-sympathetic nerves and stimulated the central end in both the curarised and uncurarised animal." (P. 338.)

This operation necessitated opening the neck and passing one tube into the artery and another into the vein, and subsequently applying electrodes to the divided nerves. The morphia was evidently not found sufficiently powerful to still the animal, so the muscular system was paralysed with curare, which, according to the arch-vivisector, Claude Bernard (p. 5), leaves the animal still sensible to pain.

ILLEGAL.

he could get half-a-crown for the skin. Mary Harriet Penny said as she was passing through the trees on the day in question she heard a cry like that of a child, and looking round saw a man near the hedge stooping down and moving his arm backwards and forwards. The cries continued she should think for much more than five minutes. Then the man looked up, but she was not near enough to recognise him. Inspector Louis Fresco, of the R.S.P.C.A., said that in consequence of information he had received, he went with Police-constable New to Richmond Park and inspected the recently flayed carcase of a dog. There was a rough jagged wound in the throat, low down towards the breast. Neither the carotid artery nor the jugular vein were severed. He should say that the dog had been killed with an improper knife and that a severe struggle had taken place. The eyes of the dog were nearly out of his head. The defendant said that he had stabbed it as he would have stabbed a pig. He had killed the dog with a pocket pruning knife and a table knife. The defendant professed to have great love for the dog, and tears came into his eyes while he was killing it. The chair-

LEGAL.

(2) "We divided the spinal cord . . . and we stimulated either the central end of the cord or the vaso-motor centre in the bulb." (P. 338.)

"In the experiments the animals were placed under morphia and then lightly curarised, and artificial respiration supplied." (Ib.)

The necessity for artificial respiration is caused by the paralysis of the respiratory organs through the action of curare. The reader may judge what the poor helpless creature passed through whilst in a semi-conscious condition, having its throat cut, a tube passed into the windpipe, and connected with a bellows for forcing air into the lungs; at the same time having its backbone opened and electric shocks passed into the spinal cord at different points.

"The thorax (chest) was then opened in the middle line, and weighted hooks were used to keep the walls of the chest cavity well apart. The heart was protected from exposure by a pad of cotton wool. The sympathetic nerve was then caught up." (Ib.)

"On producing asphyxia in the curarised animal by stopping the artificial respiration, the general venous pressure at first falls." (P. 345.)

"We have noticed in the case of

ILLEGAL.

man said the magistrates were of opinion that the defendant had been guilty of barbarities unheard of in that court, which had excited the indignation of all the magistrates present. They adjudged that he be imprisoned and kept to hard labour for the space of two calendar months. (*Ib.*, p. 275.)

Dr. Hadwen adds: "Were it not that we have recorded the vivisectors' own words as to what has been actually done in one of our own London hospitals, it would be difficult to believe that any human being could be found, especially among the refined, cultured, educated classes, capable of calmly performing such revolting experiments upon the brains, hearts, throats, and blood-vessels, &c., of these 'friends of man,' rendered incapable of resistance or of uttering even a cry of distress by reason of the 'hellish wourali' which has been administered."

Though the brutality of Hallet makes the blood run cold, that of Bayliss and Hill fearfully exceeds his. And they did not torture one dog, but many. But the vivisector takes care to put it beyond the power of his victim to "cry like a child"; and the Law permits him to carry on his cruelties where no passer-by shall behold what he is doing. Would his "work" long be permitted; would not popular outcry condemn it, were it not hole-and-corner work?

CASE 7.

ILLEGAL.

R— R—, manager of a firm, was summoned by the R.S.P.C.A. for cruelty to pigeons by packing them too closely in

LEGAL.

an animal insufficiently curarised that the slightest attempt at respiration on its part . . . will raise the cerebral nervous pressure."

"On injecting absinthe into the curarised animal a succession of intense spasms of the arterioles ensues." (P. 351.)

ILLEGAL.

crates for conveyance. The case for the prosecution was that about 1,000 pigeons were conveyed along Edgware Road, London, in twenty crates. Seeing that many of them were dead, and more were dying, an officer stopped the carman and took him into custody for cruelty. At the police station the dead birds were removed, and those alive were supplied with water. On an average there were thirteen birds dead of suffocation in each crate. The hot weather added to the difficulties under which the birds laboured. The defendant's answer was that no expense had been spared as it was to the firm's interest to keep the mortality down. The deaths were due to accidental causes. Mr. Curtis Bennett said that it was a bad case, and he fined the defendant £5 with £10 10s. costs, or two months' imprisonment. (*Ib.*, p. 165.)

It assuredly was an accidental cruelty to birds for which R— R— was punished, though of course carelessness is criminal in such cases. But his conduct was innocent compared to the premeditated cruelty which the doctor practised.

CASE 8.

ILLEGAL.

D— G—, Brymbo, was summoned for cruelty to a dog by throwing it down a disused shaft known as the Brynmally pit. It

LEGAL.

"Experiment 22. Two larks were placed in the chamber and the oxygen raised to a tension of 301·4 per cent. of an atmosphere. They at once became excited, and moved rapidly about the chamber. After 13 minutes exposure to this tension, they were simultaneously thrown into violent convulsions. These recurred at short intervals. They began to subside in an hour. After two hours and seven minutes the chamber was opened. One of the birds remained in an unconscious condition with occasional epileptiform convulsions for about an hour after, when it died. The other survived and was very active and restless for a while, but became later very sluggish. When it was fed by hand, however, it shook off its drowsiness for a short time, and again assumed its normal activity. It survived in this condition for several days." (*Journal of Physiology*, March 22nd, 1899.)

LEGAL.

In the *Journal of Physiology*, February, 1899, under the title "The Kidney and Metabolism," Dr. Rose Bradford, Professor Superin-

ILLEGAL.

appeared that the defendant gave a penny to a boy to throw the fox terrier in question down an old shaft, it was thrown down, as was also another dog soon after. Two boys who were near the pit were attracted by the barking of the two dogs at the bottom of the pit, and they told the police of it. All the two dogs had to live upon was the carcase of a calf which had been thrown down the pit. After the dogs were known to be down, bread and scraps were thrown down to them. A man named Francis Roberts informed the police. The pit in question was about sixty feet deep and there was no water in it. Thomas Hughes went to the pit and after considerable trouble and risk went down to the bottom and sent the two dogs up. One of them, a terrier, just managed to crawl. It was suffering terribly from starvation.

They were both in a starving condition. Defendant said that he was very sorry, but believed it was "the custom of the country." The Chairman said it was a most brutal thing to do, if it was the custom of the country to throw dogs down a pit and let them starve it must be put down with a high hand. He fined the defendant £3 11s. 6d., highly commended Francis Roberts

LEGAL.

tendent of the Brown Institution, 149, Wandsworth Road, South Lambeth, S.W., describes the results of the removal of large portions of the kidneys of 49 living dogs. The object of the experiments was to discover how the animals could sustain life, and for how long, with portions of their kidneys cut out from time to time. The anæsthesia legally required in the initial operation having passed off, the dogs were kept for observation in chambers, the floors of which were composed of glazed earthenware and the sides of glass. One dog died on the fourth day, and another on the sixth, from loss of blood; one died 36 days after the operation. In one who survived the first operation 63 days, the pelvis of the kidney was found to be full of stones. One died from shock, the operation in this case consisted in cutting a wedge out of the second kidney. In 14 cases the second operation was the removal of the entire kidney from the opposite side; after which the average duration of life was from two to three weeks, the animals becoming extremely emaciated and so weak as to be unable to stand, with ulcerated sores on the lip and cheek. In some cases more than two operations were performed on

ILLEGAL.

and Thos. Hughes for their brave conduct, and gave them a reward. The dogs were down the shaft eight weeks. (*Ib.*, p. 277.)

LEGAL.

the same animal. Two puppies were experimented upon, both survived the operation four months.

Other "customs of the country" such as are recorded in the right hand column above are surely in as great need of "being put down with a high hand."

CASE 9.

ILLEGAL.

A— B—, a prepossessing young woman, was summoned to the St. Asaph Petty Sessions for cruelly ill-treating a Welsh sheep-dog, belonging to the Bishop of St. Asaph, by scalding it with boiling water to release it from another dog, whereby it had suffered much agony and was destroyed to put it out of its misery. The Bench considered the offence proved, and though they admitted, considering the circumstances, that ignorance might have prompted the defendant's conduct, she was fined five pounds and costs. (*Ib.*, p. 524.)

LEGAL.

Dr. Sherrington, at Liverpool, experimented on monkeys by removing the brain hemispheres and thus blinding them. He next "stimulated" their hands and feet by dipping them into hot water, which caused "the wrist to be extended, the elbow flexed, the shoulder retracted, the upper arm being drawn forward and somewhat across the chest." Similar results were obtained in the hind limb. He adds: "Hot water evokes, so far as I have seen, flexion of the ankle and knee, usually of the hip also." (*Lancet*, February 6th, 1897.)

Cruelty has been defined as the wilful infliction of needless pain, *not for the good of the sufferer*. The young woman's idea was to rescue a dog from punishment by another dog, unfortunately she acted hastily and used mistaken means. The doctor had no benevolent motive towards the poor monkeys which he tormented. Yet the man escapes and the woman is punished. Though an anæsthetic may have been used during the preliminary mangling of the poor monkeys, they

were evidently fully alive to what the doctor calls "stimulation," but what in ordinary language means "scalding." For the doctor it was legal, for the servant, illegal.

CASE 10.

ILLEGAL.

G— T— K—, vendor of cats' meat, was charged at Clerkenwell Police Court with wounding a hind leg of a dog by throwing a knife at it. In defence it was alleged that the defendant was annoyed at dogs running into his shop and stealing his meat. He threw the knife at the animal to drive it away, and had no intention of hurting it. He was committed to jail for fourteen days. (*Ib.*, p. 512.) For a similar offence Dr. B—, at Greenwich, was fined forty-six shillings and costs. (*Ib.*)

In order, then, to escape the strong arm of the Law, cruelty must be premeditated. Perpetrate it in cold blood and you may be as barbarous as you please. A cats' meat man, under provocation, loses his temper and throws the nearest missile at a dog, accidentally wounding him, and the Law sends him to prison. A learned physiologist acts with deliberation and employs his leisure as above described, as regards a creature which had never harmed him, and does it lawfully.

CASE 11.

ILLEGAL.

W— A— was charged at Greenwich Police Court with having tortured a dog by cutting

LEGAL.

In experiment 5, p. 23, of *An Experimental Research into Surgical Shock*, by Dr. Crile, we read that the shoulder, spinal column, and ribs of a dog were mutilated, and that "under incomplete anaesthesia" (that is to say, while sensible of suffering) "crushing of foot caused a very sharp rise followed by an equally sharp decline of" (blood) "pressure. Under full anaesthesia crushing of paws caused rise again." After this, various nerves were stretched, the abdomen was opened, &c.

LEGAL.

On p. 22 of *An Experimental Research into Surgical Shock*, by Dr. Crile, we read: Experiment 4, Collie

ILLEGAL.

off its tail. Mr. Trall, Stipendiary Magistrate, said he hoped the punishment he was going to inflict would stop such cruel practices. He sentenced the defendant to 21 days' imprisonment with hard labour, (*Cruelty to Animals*, p. 527.) G— T—, for a similar offence to "improve the dog's appearance," was sentenced to the same term with hard labour. (*Ib.*, p. 533.)

Coarse and foolish as the louts may be who cut off dogs' tails under the impression that their beauty will be improved thereby, it is somewhat hard on them to be punished while an educated man may commit with impunity such cruelties as are recorded in the column to the right. This is not the justice which the working man has a right to demand. The Law, like Pilate, virtually washes its hands of the vivisector's barbarities, and delivers the victim to his will.

We close with an unabridged account of Dr. Crile's behaviour towards another of the 16 unhappy dogs which he vivisected at University College, London, as a contrast to milder types heavily visited by the Law.

CASE 12.

ILLEGAL.

J— B— was indicted at Chester Assizes for wounding a helper. He thrust an iron spike through the uterus and rectum. Sentenced by Sir Henry Hawkins "with a view to stopping these horrible practices," to ten years' penal servitude. Sir Henry Hawkins

LEGAL.

terrier. (1) Crushing of paw with forceps. (2) Crushed foot extensively, "just before corneal reflex was abolished" (that is to say, while the animal was still sensitive to pain). Then followed in succession the tearing out of the nerves of the fore-limbs, severe crushing of the fore-limbs, crushing testes, cutting the spermatic cord, opening the abdomen, &c.

LEGAL.

In *An Experimental Research into Surgical Shock*, by Dr. Crile, pp. 30-31, we read: May 27th, 1895. Dog, weight seven kilos. Both stellate ganglia removed. Blood-pressure at beginning of experiment 120 millimetres. Animal in good condition at beginning of experi-

ILLEGAL.

in passing sentence said he had not a doubt as to the guilt of the defendant. It made his blood run cold to think there could possibly exist such a monster as the prisoner had proved himself to be. He was not quite sure if this case was not worse than many cases of murder, in which a prisoner had paid the last penalty of the law. The prisoner must be dead to every sense of humanity. Henry Theobald was similarly sentenced for wounding a mare. J—— J—— and T—— P—— for similar offences were sentenced to penal servitude for ten and seven years respectively for offences of the same kind. (*ib.* pp. 556-7.)

That just judge, Sir Henry Hawkins, now Lord Brampton, detested Vivisection. He said of it, "Vivisection is horribly cruel and futile." Yet the same legal system which enabled him to punish B——, licensed Crile to torture as above!

It must be granted that the moral lesson taught by the Law, as drawn from these cases of Legal and Illegal Cruelty is practically this.

A. It is wrong for men to ill-treat animals for ANY PURPOSE WHATEVER.

B. It is right for Man to ill-treat animals, provided THAT HE THINKS BY SUCH MEANS TO RELIEVE HIS OWN PAINS OR ADVANCE HIS SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE.

Who shall reconcile A and B?

LEGAL.

ment. Crushing paws caused no change in pressure. Placing the hind foot in boiling water for a considerable time produced no change in blood-pressure. Small abdominal incision made, through which warm water was poured into the abdomen, caused slight rise in pressure and an increase in the heart-strokes; respiration increased in frequency and depth. Hot water poured into the abdominal cavity caused first a fall and then a gradual rise in blood-pressure. Respirations were at first greatly accelerated in rhythm with an over-inspiratory tonus. Later the respirations failed before the heart did.

The official Report on Vivisection for last year (1900) publishes the plain and awful fact that during the twelve months referred to 10,839 animals were done to death, in many cases under circumstances of exquisite and prolonged torture, on the strained plea of benefiting human beings; and those who abused and ill-treated them did it without punishment, because they were licensed by the law. In the same country, under the same Laws, 7,894 persons were punished for minor cruelties.

It was asserted just now that the attitude of the Law towards vivisectionable animals resembled that of Pilate, when on a memorable occasion, he washed his hands before a multitude. This was advisedly said. Recognising a responsibility in shedding innocent blood, he sought to shirk it by an idle form. This is precisely what the Law does in regard to Vivisection. A certain empty form exists which professes to "restrict" Vivisection. It strives to draw a four-fold blind across the eyes of the public. There is, (*a*) The License Hocus-Pocus. There is, (*b*) "The Anæsthetic Cheat," as Dr. Berdoe calls it. There is, (*c*) The Government Inspection Humbug; and finally, there is, (*d*) The Deceptive Government Report.

(*a.*) Of what use is the Licensing Hocus-Pocus? A man must get a license before he may vivisection, and it compels him to use anæsthetics. But he can obtain another license permitting him to dispense with the use of anæsthetics or to dispense with the obligation to kill the animal before it awakens to a sense of its misery. As a matter of fact out of the 10,839 animals Vivisected in Great Britain during the year 1900, 8,954 were operated on without any anæsthetic.

(*b.*) The "Anæsthetic Cheat" has already been fully exposed in this paper (p. 3).

(c.) The Inspector under the Act is not appointed to prevent cruelty, but to see that the provisions of the Act are carried out. This means that he must see that Vivisectors are armed with certificates and that their operations are carried out in registered places. Nothing more. There is ground for assuming that Inspectors are chosen from among those who sympathise with Vivisectors. The annual returns of the experiments published by the present Inspector, Professor G. D. Thane, are furnished by the Vivisectors themselves; laboratories are private places, and after the Inspector's visit, once, twice, or thrice a year, the Vivisector can do, behind locked doors, just what he pleases.

(d.) The Official Report is worse than no protection to vivisectionable animals; it cries, peace, peace, when there is no peace, and soothes the public conscience with sophistries. Of these the greatest is an assertion that a large proportion of the experiments are painless (see Report for 1900). It is a favourite tarradiddle in these Yearly Reports to assert that experiments in a multitude of cases involve no more pain than "the prick of a pin" would do. True! *for the moment*. An injection of poison may not hurt the animal much for the moment, but what about the results? The other day a gardener in my neighbourhood, while pruning rose trees was pricked by a thorn on the lobe of the ear. Naturally he took no notice of this, but in a few days he became ill and took to his bed. Erysipelas set in, his sufferings were very great, and in about ten days he died. Did his doctor say that this poor fellow suffered no more pain than "the prick of a pin" would inflict? No, equivocations of this sort are reserved for Government Reports. The Vivisector's pinprick! Gentle, harmless inoculation or injection! Case 1 of Legal Cruelty shows the results of the Vivisector's pinprick. And

Hydrophobia, Tetanus (Lockjaw), or Diphtheria (in consequence of "pinpricks") are not pleasant modes of death. This is what perhaps happens to a dog when hydrophobia has been artificially produced in his system by the "pinprick."

"In the case of a dog mental anguish is the first symptom. The poor brute appears conscious that it must soon become dangerous and as if wanting to beg pardon beforehand Towards the last the dog's thirst increases, but with that comes swelling of the throat. He will then plunge his head into water, so ravenous is his desire, but not a drop of liquid can he swallow, though its surface is covered with bubbles in consequence of the efforts he makes to gulp the smallest quantity. The throat is enlarged to that extent that it will permit nothing to pass. He is the victim of the most horrible inflammation of the stomach and intense inflammation of the bowels. His state of suffering is most pitiable. He flies at and pulls to pieces anything that is within his reach. One animal in this condition being confined near a fire flew at the burning mass, pulled out the live coals, and in his fury scrunched them." (*Pasteur et la Rage*, p. 28.)

Of the Vivisector's "pinprick" and the unscrupulous lies told to the public thereanent, Dr. Wilson, in the course of an Address, delivered at the opening of the Section of State Medicine, at the Annual Meeting of the British Medical Association, Portsmouth, August, 1899, remarked:—

"I accuse my profession of misleading the public as to the cruelties and horrors which are perpetrated on animal life. When it is stated that the actual pain involved in these experiments is commonly of the most trifling description there is a *suppressio veri*" (suppression of the truth) "of the most palpable kind."

In the face of all this our duty lies very clearly before us. It is to sting the National Conscience into a reformation of the National Laws.

Let Vivisection be but made infamous, and it will quickly be made illegal.

Our aim must be to abolish this enormity **ALTOGETHER**.

It is the duty of Voters, in the first place, who are responsible for the Laws. It is the duty of every man to interest himself, and it is the duty of every woman to interest herself in the question.

Not one of us, neither man nor woman, has the right to eat and drink and sleep, to laugh and talk, to buy and sell as if nothing were amiss, till this great and crying wrong be righted.

We must persuade the clergy to preach against it, authors to write against it, orators to hurl thunders of eloquence against it, rich men to give money to carry on the crusade against it, poor men to rebel against it, electors to make a test question of it, we must leave no stone unturned till the whole land thrills with horror at the wretches who practise it and cries "**DOWN WITH THE LAW WHICH SANCTIONS VIVISECTION!**"

EDITH CARRINGTON.

23026

**END OF
TITLE**